



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,544	01/31/2005	Brian Davidson	915-011-002-1	7521

4955 7590 07/08/2008
WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER

KARIKARI, KWASI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/08/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/523,544

Applicant(s)

DAVIDSON, BRIAN

Examiner

KWASI KARIKARI

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 40-53.59-62.64.66 and 68-77 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 59-62.66.68 and 73 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 40-53.59-62.64.66 and 68-77 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 04/07/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. In the remarks the Applicant argues that a skilled person would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Briffett and Sasakura.

The examiner disagrees with such an assertion since the examiner must give each claim presented its broadest reasonable interpretation. The examiner also recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, both Briffett and Sasakura are analogous art. Furthermore, Sasakura clearly teaches a control means, having a first mode; and the control means effects at least partial disablement of the device (see col. 8, lines 32-38) effect at least partial disablement of the device, see col. 9, lines 7-29). However, Sasakura fails specifically to teach a "whenever a releasable connector is release from the connector".

Briffett, however teaches a release of a releasable connector connecting the device to a person (see col. 4, lines 22-60; and Fig. 3-6). Therefore the combination of Sasakura and Briffett is proper.

b. Regarding claim 40, the Applicant argues that both Sasakura and Briffett clearly would not comprise "control means, having a first mode in which whenever the releasable connector is released, the control means effects at least partial disablement of the device in response to the release of the releasable connector".

The Examiner maintains that both Sasakura and Briffett teaches the claimed limitations control means, having a first mode in which whenever the releasable connector is released, the control means effects at least partial disablement of the device in response to the release of the releasable connector".

Sasakura clearly teaches a control means, having a first mode; and the control means effects at least partial disablement of the device (= unit 20 is on, see col. 8, lines 32-38, whereby the "on" is been associated with the "first mode") effect at least partial disablement of the device (cell phone 30 is disables when separated for a predetermined distance, see col. 9, lines 7-29). However, Sasakura fails specifically to teach a "whenever a releasable connector is release from the connector"

However, Briffett teaches a release of a releasable connector connecting the device to a person (connection between belt clip proximity unit 46 and the telephone proximity unit 16, see col. 4, lines 22-60; and Fig. 3-6).

Based on the above clarification, the Office Action is made Final as shown below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 40-45, 48-52, and 64 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasakura et al. (U.S 6,151,493), (hereinafter Sasakura) in view of Briffett et al. (U.S 6,154,665), (hereinafter Briffett).

Regarding claims 40 and 48, Sasakura discloses a device (see Fig. 1) comprising:

unauthorized separation detection means (see col. 3, lines 44-59) and control means, having a first mode (= unit 20 is on, see col. 8, lines 32-38, whereby the "on" is been associated with the "first mode") effect at least partial disablement of the device (cell phone 30 is disables when separated for a predetermined distance, see col. 9, lines 7-29); but fails specifically to teach a whenever a releasable connector connecting the device to a person is released.

However, Briffett teaches a release of a releasable connector connecting the device to a person (connection between belt clip proximity unit 46 and the telephone proximity unit 16, see col. 4, lines 22-60; and Fig. 3-6).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Briffett with the system of Sasakura for the benefit of achieving a arrangement that includes a belt clip assembly which enables a user to attach a telephone to his belt for convenient transportation (see col. 2, line 66- col. 3, lines 5).

Regarding claims 41 and 49, as recited in claims 40 and 48, Sasakura fails to teach that the releasable connector comprises a strap.

However, Briffett teaches that the releasable connector comprises a strap (connection between belt clip proximity unit 46 and the telephone proximity unit 16, see col. 4, lines 22-60; and Fig. 3-6)

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Briffett with the system of Sasakura for the benefit of achieving a arrangement that includes a belt clip assembly which enables a user to attach a telephone to his belt for convenient transportation (see col. 2, line 66- col. 3, lines 5).

Regarding claims 42 and 50, as recited in claims 40 and 48, Sasakura fails to teach that the releasable connector is released by severance.

However, Briffett teaches that the releasable connector is released by severance. (rapid moment, see col. 6, lines 10-17)

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Briffett with the system of Sasakura for the benefit of achieving

a arrangement that includes a belt clip assembly which enables a user to attach a telephone to his belt for convenient transportation (see col. 2, line 66- col. 3, lines 5).

Regarding claim 43, as recited in claims 40, Sasakura fails to teach the interruption of a closed conductive path via the releasable connector.

However, Briffett teaches the interruption of a closed conductive path via the releasable connector (no electric contact, see col. 4, lines 27-39)

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Briffett with the system of Sasakura for the benefit of achieving a arrangement that includes a belt clip assembly which enables a user to attach a telephone to his belt for convenient transportation (see col. 2, line 66- col. 3, lines 5).

Regarding claim 44, as recited in claim 40, Sasakura further teaches that the device comprises a cellular radio transceiver (see items 31a and 33d in Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 45, as recited in claim 44, Sasakura further teaches that the control means is arranged to effect at least partial disablement of the device by controlling the cellular radio transceiver to transmit a disabling message instructing the at least partial disablement of the device (cell phone 30 is disabled when separated for a predetermined distance, see col. 9, lines 7-29).

Regarding claim 52, as recited in claim 48, Sasakura further teaches radio transmitter (items 31a and 33d in the cell phone 30, see Fig. 1) wherein the controller is arranged to control the radio transmitter to send a message (cell phone 30 is disabled when separated for a predetermined distance, see col. 9, lines 7-29); but fails to teach a releasable connector.

However, Briffett teaches a release of a releasable connector (connection between belt clip proximity unit 46 and the telephone proximity unit 16, see col. 4, lines 22-60; and Fig. 3-6)

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Briffett with the system of Sasakura for the benefit of achieving an arrangement that includes a belt clip assembly which enables a user to attach a telephone to his belt for convenient transportation (see col. 2, line 66- col. 3, lines 5).

Regarding claim 64, as recited in claim 48, Sasakura fails to teach "releasable connector" from the device.

However, Briffett teaches a release of a releasable connector (connection between belt clip proximity unit 46 and the telephone proximity unit 16, see col. 4, lines 22-60; and Fig. 3-6)

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Briffett with the system of Sasakura for the benefit of achieving an arrangement that includes a belt clip assembly which enables a user to attach a telephone to his belt for convenient transportation (see col. 2, line 66- col. 3, lines 5).

Regarding claim 51, as recited in claims 64, Sasakura fails to teach the interruption of a closed conductive path via the releasable connector.

However, Briffett teaches a release of a releasable connector (connection between belt clip proximity unit 46 and the telephone proximity unit 16, see col. 4, lines 22-60; and Fig. 3-6)

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Briffett with the system of Sasakura for the benefit of achieving a arrangement that includes a belt clip assembly which enables a user to attach a telephone to his belt for convenient transportation (see col. 2, line 66- col. 3, lines 5).

Regarding claim 74, as recited in claims 48, Sasakura fails to teach the releasable connector is a neck strap.

However, Briffett teaches the releasable connector is a neck strap (see col. 2, line 66- col. 3, lines 5, col. 4, lines 22-60; and Fig. 3-6).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Briffett with the system of Sasakura for the benefit of achieving a arrangement that includes a belt clip assembly which enables a user to attach a telephone to his belt for convenient transportation (see col. 2, line 66- col. 3, lines 5).

Regarding claim 75, as recited in claims 48, Sasakura fails to teach the releasable connector is a wrist strap.

However, Briffett teaches that the releasable connector is a wrist strap (see col. 2, line 66- col. 3, lines 5, col. 4, lines 22-60; and Fig. 3-6).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Briffett with the system of Sasakura for the benefit of achieving a arrangement that includes a belt clip assembly which enables a user to attach a telephone to his belt for convenient transportation (see col. 2, line 66- col. 3, lines 5).

Regarding claim 76, as recited in claims 48, Sasakura fails to teach that the releasable connector has an inherent weakness, such that it is arranged to break when the device is grabbed.

However, Briffett teaches that the releasable connector has an inherent weakness, such that it is arranged to break when the device is grabbed (= when the telephone is "removed from" the belt clip, see col. 4, lines 23-39).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Briffett with the system of Sasakura for the benefit of achieving a arrangement that includes a belt clip assembly which enables a user to attach a telephone to his belt for convenient transportation (see col. 2, line 66- col. 3, lines 5).

3. **Claims 46, 47 and 53 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasakura in view of Briffett and further in view of Rohrbach (U.S. 5,898,783), (hereinafter Rohrbach).**

Regarding claims 46 and 53, as recited in claims 40 and 48, Sasakura teaches radio transmitter (items 31a and 33d in the cell phone 30, see Fig. 1)

However, the combination of Sasakura and Briffett specifically fails to mention a cellular communications network and the control means is arranged to effect at least partial disablement of the device by sending a disabling message "to the network" instructing the network to disable normal operation of the telephone in the network.

Rohrbach further teaches that the data communication circuitry 200 transmits a code to the communication network via the mobile station 100 and in response to receiving a disable command, the disabling circuitry 220 is operative to prevent operation of the SIM card in the network (see col. 4, lines 14-25, col. 5, lines 13-31 and Figs. 2 & 3; i.e., the mobile phone operates to prevent the use of the sim card after obtain a disable command which is known to both the phone and the communication system that grants operational access to the phone).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Rohrbach into the system of Sasakura and Briffett for the benefit of achieving a system that provides a way of remotely disabling SIMs and smartcard in the telecommunication network.

Regarding claim 47, as recited in claim 46, the combination of Sasakura and Briffett fails to teach that the mobile telephone comprises a handset and a "replaceable card", which enables the handset to operate as a telephone in the network, and the network is responsive to the disabling message sent by the mobile telephone to disable the card

from normal use in the network and/or to disable the handset from normal use in the network.

Rohrbach further teaches that the SIM card 110 or smart card cooperates with a mobile phone 100 to effect communication with the telecommunication network (see col. 3, lines 61-66).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Rohrbach into the system of Sasakura and Briffett for the benefit of achieving a system that provides a way of remotely disabling SIMs and smartcard in the telecommunication network.

4. **Claims 69-72 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasakura in view of Briffett and further in view of Namekawa (U.S. 4,809,316), (hereinafter Namekawa).**

Regarding claim 69, as recited in claim 40, the combination of Sarakura and Briffett fails to disclose the device, wherein the **control means has a second, operable, mode** in which it does not respond to the release of the releasable connector.

However Namekawa teaches a controller that checks the on/off state of a sensor (see col. 3, line 46- col. 5, line 23, and col. 5, line 12-43, whereby the second mode is being associated with the power off state).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Namekawa into the system of Sasakura and Briffett for the

benefit of achieving a system that include power-on at a predetermined time, whereby power consumption is reduced in the system (see col. 1, lines 55-62).

Regarding claim 70, as recited in claim 48, the combination of Sarakura and Briffett fails to disclose the device, wherein the **control means has a second, operable, mode** in which it does not respond to the release of the releasable connector.

However Namekawa teaches a controller that checks the on/off state of a sensor (see col. 3, line 46- col. 5, line 23, and col. 5, line 12-43, whereby the second mode is being associated with the power off state).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Namekawa into the system of Sasakura and Briffett for the benefit of achieving a system that include power-on at a predetermined time, whereby power consumption is reduced in the system (see col. 1, lines 55-62).

Regarding claim 71, as recited in claim 69, the combination of Sarakura and Briffett fails to disclose the device, wherein the first and second modes are user selectable.

However Namekawa teaches wherein the first and second modes are user selectable (see col. 4, lines 31-66, col. 3, line 46- col. 5, line 23, and col. 5, line 12-43).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Namekawa into the system of Sasakura and Briffett for the benefit of achieving a system that include power-on at a predetermined time, whereby power consumption is reduced in the system (see col. 1, lines 55-62).

Regarding claim 72, as recited in claim 70, the combination of Sarakura and Briffett fails to disclose the device, wherein the first and second modes are user selectable.

However Namekawa teaches wherein the first and second modes are user selectable (see col. 4, lines 31-66, col. 3, line 46- col. 5, line 23, and col. 5, line 12-43).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Namekawa into the system of Sasakura and Briffett for the benefit of achieving a system that include power-on at a predetermined time, whereby power consumption is reduced in the system (see col. 1, lines 55-62).

Rejection for the newly added claim

5. **Claim 77 is rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasakura et al. (U.S. 6,151,493), (hereinafter Sasakura) in view of Briffett et al. (U.S. 6,154,665), (hereinafter Briffett).**

Regarding claim 77, Sasakura discloses a method comprising:

detecting the unauthorized separation (see col. 3, lines 44-59) and while the device is in a first mode (= unit 20 is on, see col. 8, lines 32-38, whereby the "on" is been associated with the "first mode") effect at least partial disablement of the device (cell phone 30 is disables when separated for a predetermined distance, see col. 9, lines 7-29); but fails specifically to teach "detecting the release of a releasable connector connecting the device to the person and releasable connector is not connected to the device".

However, Briffett teaches a release of a releasable connector connecting the device to a person (connection between belt clip proximity unit 46 and the telephone proximity unit 16, see col. 4, lines 22-60; and Fig. 3-6).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Briffett with the system of Sasakura for the benefit of achieving an arrangement that includes a belt clip assembly which enables a user to attach a telephone to his belt for convenient transportation (see col. 2, line 66- col. 3, lines 5).

CONCLUSION

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. SEE MPEP 2141.02 [R-5] VI. PRIOR ART MUST BE CONSIDERED IN ITS ENTIRETY, INCLUDING DISCLOSURES THAT TEACH AWAY FROM THE CLAIMS: A prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert.

denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984) In re Fulton, 391 F.3d 1195, 1201, 73 USPQ2d 1141, 1146 (Fed. Cir. 2004). >See also MPEP §2123.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kwasi Karikari whose telephone number is 571-272-8566. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T (9am - 7pm).
If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah can be reached on 571-272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8566.
Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Art Unit: 2617

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kwasi Karikari
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2617
07/03/2008

/Charles N. Appiah/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617